

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 6 stands objected to because “martial” (line 6) should read “material.”

Claim 7 stands objected to because “martial” (line 2) should read “material.”

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,284,562 to Bartlogg et al. (hereinafter “Bartlogg”) together with U.S. Patent No. 5,801,398 to Hebiguchi (hereinafter “Hebiguchi”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has newly-amended claim 5, and added new claims 9-15, to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application’s specification and/or to improve the form of the claims. Applicant has canceled claims 1-4 and 6-8 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 5 and 9-15 are currently pending for consideration.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 stands objected to because “martial” (line 6) should read “material.” Claim 7 stands objected to because “martial” (line 2) should read “material.” Applicant has canceled claims 6 and 7 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering these objections moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 6 and 7 are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 5 to improve the form of the claims in light of the Examiner's comments at page 2 of the Office Action in this regard. Claims 6-8 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejections of these claims moot. Applicant respectfully submit that claim 5, as amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

For example, the portion of original claim 5 "the wiring line being made of the same material used for the source electrode or the drain electrode" is replaced with "the wiring line being made of a material of one of the source and drain electrodes of the p-type channel organic semiconductor element" in the amended claim 5 as one feature of the present invention.

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that another feature of the present invention of "the wiring line being made of a material of one of the source and drain electrodes of the n-type channel organic semiconductor element" has been described in newly-added independent claim 12. This feature is supported, for example, at lines 11-13 on page 5 of the specification of the present application.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn because the claims in their currently-pending form now fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlogg together with Hebiguchi. Claims 1-4 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejections of these claims moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections based on the cited references Bartlogg and Hebiguchi should be withdrawn in light of the features included in the combinations of the currently pending claims.

For example, the portion of original claim 5 “the wiring line being made of the same material used for the source electrode or the drain electrode” is replaced with “the wiring line being made of a material of one of the source and drain electrodes of the p-type channel organic semiconductor element” in the amended claim 5 as one feature of the present invention.

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that another feature of the present invention of “the wiring line being made of a material of one of the source and drain electrodes of the n-type channel organic semiconductor element” has been described in newly-added independent claim 12. This feature is supported, for example, at lines 11-13 on page 5 of the specification of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Bartlogg nor Hebiguchi, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 5 and 12 of the currently pending claims. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent

claims 9-11 and 13-15 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claims 5 or 12, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: October 18, 2007

By:



Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465